

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/CA2004/000897

International filing date (day/month/year)
18.06.2004

Priority date (day/month/year)
18.06.2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
G06F17/30, H04L9/00, G06F17/27, G06F3/023

Applicant
ZI CORPORATION

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office
D-80298 Munich
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Jaedicke, M

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-2357



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

10/561380
IAP9 Rec'd PCT/PTO 16 DEC 2009
International application No.
PCT/CA2004/000897

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 - ☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
 - ☐ a sequence listing
 - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
 - ☐ in written format
 - ☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
 - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
 - ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/CA2004/000897

Box No. II Priority

1. ☒ The following document has not been furnished:

☒ copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(a)).

☐ translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.

3. ☐ It has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim because a copy of the priority document was not available to the ISA at the time that the search was conducted (Rule 17.1). This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

4. Additional observations, if necessary:

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43*bis*.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1,4-18, 21-25
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-26
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-26
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Re Item V

Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: EP-A-1 031 913 (NOKIA MOBILE PHONES LTD) 30 August 2000 (2000-08-30)
D2: US-A-5 818 437 (GROVER DALE L ET AL) 6 October 1998 (1998-10-06)
D3: US-A-5 953 541 (GRUNBOCK CHERYL A ET AL) 14 September 1999 (1999-09-14)
D4: EP-A-1 259 051 (TENOVIS GMBH & CO KG) 20 November 2002 (2002-11-20)
D5: EP-A-1 006 704 (ECI TELECOM LTD) 7 June 2000 (2000-06-07)
D6: GB-A-2 197 097 (UNIV DUNDEE) 11 May 1988 (1988-05-11)
D7: US 2002/198027 A1 (RYDBECK NILS R) 26 December 2002 (2002-12-26)

2. At least some of the claimed subject-matters are unclear (Article 6 PCT). Hence the examination as to the requirements of Article 33(1) PCT is based on the examiner's interpretation of what is claimed, based on the application as a whole.

In particular, the wording of claim 1 is rather broad and vague and needs to be interpreted in the light of the description. For example, it is not clear why the processor could be only capable to execute one of the software modules. Such a broad claim is also not fully supported by the description (Article 6 PCT).

3. The document D2 is regarded as being the closest prior art to the subject-matter of claim 1 and discloses (see D2, Fig 3. and col. 1, line 33 - col. 3, line 14):

A predictive editor which allows a user to enter an input key sequence which can be interpreted as a sequence of characters representing a word such as "aid" (first data type) or a number such as "166" (second data type) said editor having disambiguation software modules which search databases to find words etc matching the input sequence using different interpretations of the input keys (first and second information-search software modules) and which presents the user a list of selectable choices in e.g. decreasing frequency of use (i.e. the first set of information is more easily accessible).

Because all the features of claim 1 have already been disclosed in D2, the subject-matter of claim 1 does not meet the requirements of Article 33 PCT in respect of novelty.

- 3.1 The objection against the novelty of claim 1 applies, *mutatis mutandis*, also to claim 18, which is directed to a method corresponding to claim 1.
4. The further claims 2-17 and 19-26 would appear to be not novel or inventive, because the subject matter added by these claims is either known from or suggested by the available prior art (cf. D2; if necessary in combination with D1 and D3-D7; please note that D1 references D2 (which means that a combination of D1 with D2 can be used to object to the novelty of claim 1) and mentions *inter alia* Internet browsing, phone books, and SMS as applications; moreover, a guess-ahead of phone numbers based on the leading digits from an existing phone book etc. is well known in the art).
5. It is not at present apparent which part of the application could serve as a basis for a new claim which would satisfy the criteria set forth in Article 33(1) PCT.

Should the applicant nevertheless regard some particular matter as suitable an independent claim including such particular matter should be filed taking account of Rule 6.3(b) PCT. The applicant should also indicate in the letter of reply the difference *vis-à-vis* the state of the art and the significance thereof.

When filing amendments, the following should be observed: in order to facilitate the examination of the conformity of the amended application with the requirements of Article 34(2)(b) PCT, the applicant is requested to clearly identify the amendments carried out, no matter whether they concern amendments by addition, replacement or deletion, and to indicate the **exact** passages of the application as filed on which these amendments are based (see also Rule 66.8(a) PCT).